DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 392 743 SP 036 476

AUTHOR Ganser, Tom
TITLE Students' Perceptions of Appropriate Placements for an Early Field Experience.
PUB DATE 27 Feb 96
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (St. Louis, MO, February 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Environment; Education Majors; Elementary Secondary Education; *Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; Special Education; *Student Attitudes; *Student Experience; Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS Preservice Teachers; *University of Wisconsin Whitewater

ABSTRACT

Like student teaching, early field experiences are a universal feature of teacher preparation. These experiences are intended to serve several purposes. They provide teacher candidates with opportunities for career exploration, bridge the gap between theory and classroom practice, meet state licensing requirements, and, like student teaching, socialize prospective teachers for their roles in the classroom. This paper reports on a study of the Pre-Professional Block program for teacher education students at the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, covering the procedures for making placement assignments, transportation arrangements, scheduling, and other issues. The study included 294 students enrolled in the program, of whom 75 percent were female, ranging in age from 18 to 45, with an average age of 22. Participants completed surveys prior to their first day and prior to their eighth day of field experience. Findings indicated a strong agreement among participants that they had been assigned to an appropriate grade level for their preparation as a teacher. By gender, males perceived their placements as less appropriate than did females. By age group, younger participants were more positive about their placements than were older participants. In general, special education majors viewed their placement level as less appropriate than did regular education majors. With rare exceptions, the participants found the type of assigned classroom (i.e., regular or special education classroom) to be less appropriate in comparison to the level of their placement (elementary, middle school, high school); males perceived their assigned classroom to be slightly less appropriate than did females. By age subgroup, the perceived appropriateness of classroom type increased for the younger groups but decreased for the oldest participants, especially in the differences between the ratings before and after the trips. The most striking differences appeared in comparing ratings by major. Special education majors perceived their assigned classroom as considerably less appropriate than did their regular education counterparts. Excerpts from some of the comments made by participants are included. (Contains 27 references.) (ND)

Running head: STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF APPROPRIATE PLACEMENTS

ED 392 743

Students' Perceptions of Appropriate Placements for an Early Field Experience

Tom Ganser

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

February 27, 1996

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Ganser

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This paper was prepared for presentation at the 1996 Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, St. Louis, Missouri.

Criticism and reactions to this paper are invited by the author:

Tom Ganser, Director
Office of Field Experiences
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Whitewater, Wisconsin 53190-1790
Telephone: (414) 472-1123
FAX: (414) 472-5716
Internet: gansert@uwwvax.uww.edu

SP036474

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Students' Perceptions of Appropriate Placements for an Early Field Experience

Like student teaching, early field experiences are a universal feature of teacher preparation. A study of 90 members of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in 1990 revealed that teacher candidates spent 65 to more than 100 hours in early field experiences (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1991). In some states, the required number of early field experience hours is far greater, as in Ohio where the requirement is 300 hours.

Considering the wide-spread perceived value of the student teaching experience (Watts, 1987), it is understandable that other experiences requiring time in classrooms are also viewed favorably. More importantly, beliefs about the value of early field experiences have been transformed into licensing requirements by state departments of education (AACTE, 1991; Lanier & Little, 1986;) and are reflected in accreditation expectations (National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1995).

Early field experiences are intended to serve several purposes. They provide teacher candidates with opportunities for career exploration. They are also typically linked to specific education courses and are intended to bridge the gap between theory and classroom practice (Bishoff, Farris, & Henniger, 1988; Pierce, 1996). Early field experiences are often designed to meet state licensing requirements, including hours spent in

schools before student teaching and human relations. Although program objectives may focus on the progression of early experiences, e.g., moving from passive "observation" of teaching to active "participation" in teaching, state licensing requirements tend to place greater emphasis on hours spent in classrooms and less on what happens during that time. Most importantly, early field experiences, like student teaching, socialize prospective teachers for their roles in the classroom (Feiman-Nemser, 1983; Howey & Zimpher, 1996; Zeichner & Gore, 1990).

The problems associated with student teaching (Ganser, in press; Guyton & McIntyre, 1990; Knowles & Cole, 1996) are present in early field experiences. The role of the cooperating teacher is frequently ambiguous (Kagan & Warren, 1991-92) and conducted with little preparation and few incentives (AACTE, 1991). Equally problematic is providing university supervision that is both appropriate to early field experiences (Kline & Potthoff, 1996; Potthoff & Kline, 1995) and economically viable within the context of limited resources.

The Pre-Professional Block Field Experience

The University of Wisconsin-Whitewater is the second largest producer of teachers in Wisconsin among 32 schools, colleges, or departments of education. Since Fall, 1991, undergraduate education majors have started their sequence of teacher education courses with enrollment in the Pre-Professional Block. This block (so named because students must "block out" Tuesdays and

Thursdays for the program) includes enrollment in three three-credit courses: (1) Education in a Pluralistic Society, (2) Child Development or Educational Psychology (depending on major), and (3) Observation and Participation. In some cases, teacher candidates also simultaneously enroll in an introduction to exceptionalities.

As part of the Pre-Professional Block, students are assigned to a 50 hour classroom experience shadowing a classroom teacher in a Milwaukee public school. Milwaukee Public Schools serves approximately 100,000 students in 155 schools. The experience includes eight full days in the school, following the school's schedule. During each semester, a small number of students in the Pre-Professional Block participate in Project STREAM [Support, Training, and Resources for Educating Able Minorities], an alternative field experience in which education majors shadow middle school students (Clasen, 1993; Clasen, Middleton, & Connell, 1994). During the fall semester, the trips to Milwaukee occur over eight consecutive weeks, beginning the fifth week of the semester; during the spring semester, the trips are scheduled over a period of nine or ten weeks due to spring vacation periods.

Before the trips to Milwaukee begin, students meet in classes for their courses on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and continue to do so on Thursdays once the trips begin. During the trips, students meet in small groups either at school sites or on campus on Thursdays. After the final trip, students once again meet in

their classes on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Supervision is provided primarily by regular university faculty who are assigned to two or three schools. Supervisors generally visit their assigned school during at least four of the trips and usually seven or eight times. Cooperating teachers are required to complete an evaluation form consisting of three detailed Likert scale items and ample space for additional comments.

Students are assessed a $65 fee for transportation to and from the assigned schools located 45-55 miles from campus. Transportation is provided by chartered school buses or state-owned vans driven by students who are enrolled in the Pre-Professional Block and successfully complete a state requires van driving training workshop. Students are not permitted to provide their own transportation and are not allowed to leave the field site during the day. Descriptions of the Pre-Professional Block program can be found in Epps (in press) and Epps and Ganser (1993).

The 50 hours spent in a Milwaukee school partially fulfill two requirements for obtaining a teaching license from the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. First, the hours are counted toward pre-student teaching hours (100 required for regular education majors and 200 required for special education majors). Second, the hours also fulfill a portion of the human relations requirement ("fifty documented clock hours of involvement"). Successful completion of Education in a Pluralistic Society fulfills the second human relations

requirement. Finally the Pre-Professional Block is a pre-requisite for admission into Professional Education and continuing enrollment in education courses.

Several considerations are taken into account in making placements. The primary consideration is to meet state requirements for pre-student teaching hours and human relations. The pre-student teaching hours requirement specifies that special education majors are not to be placed in special education classrooms. However, all special education majors have a minimum of two experiences with special education populations after the Pre-Professional Block and before student teaching. Regular education majors may be assigned to any type of classroom. The human relations requirement specifies a diverse, multicultural setting, but not grade level or type of classroom. These licensing requirements are outlined for students at the first meeting of Observation and Participation.

There are a host of practical considerations and "administrative feasibility" issues (Myers, 1996) that influence how placements are determined. These include depending on students enrolled in the program to serve as van drivers, offering students two locations en route from campus to Milwaukee at which they can be picked up and dropped off, minimizing transportation costs by maximizing the capacity of vans or buses, using 12 to 14 different schools with different schedules, and aiming to have students at their assigned schools shortly before the beginning of the school day and until shortly after the end

of the school day. Other considerations taken into account include facilitating the work of supervisors with respect to time and distance, and maintaining continuity in use of sites. Placing students also requires sensitivity to the "saturation" level of schools as sites for 26 different teacher preparation institutions placing students in Milwaukee.

During the program's five year history, only rarely have prospective cooperating teachers expressed preferences or stipulated requirements for the students assigned to them, e.g., "business education major only," "prefer male," "must speak Spanish." In addition, a small number of students have been placed in content areas (e.g., technical education, consumer education) unrelated to any of the majors offered at the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater in response to practical needs, e.g., minimizing transportation costs by maximizing numbers of students transported in a vehicle.

Method

Participants

Two hundred and ninety-four teacher education students at the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater enrolled in the Pre-Professional Block in Fall, 1994, Spring, 1995, or Fall, 1995, participated in this study. Excluded from this study were 75 students who participated in Project STREAM.

Three-quarters of the participants were female. The average age of participants was 22 years, with a range from 18 to 45. Approximately one-third of the participants were 21 to 25 years

old, and almost 15% of them were 26 years old or older. Most participants indicated that they came from a rural and/or suburban background, and less than a fifth indicated having spent at least a portion of their lives in an urban setting. A large majority of the participants indicated that their own schooling

---

Insert Table 1 about here.

---

had been in public schools, whereas a quarter of them indicated having spent at least a portion of their schooling in private schools. Nearly two-thirds of the participants were regular education majors and about 31% were special education majors. More detailed information about the participants is displayed in Table 1.

Procedures

A survey was administered to 416 students when they received their school assignment, six days before their first trip to Milwaukee. The information indicated the school to which they were assigned, the name of their cooperating teacher, and the cooperating teacher's grade level or content area. The survey included demographic questions and six items utilizing a seven-point Likert scale (7=Agree; 1=Disagree). A similar survey was given to all students (i.e., not just those who had completed the first survey) upon leaving for their eighth trip into Milwaukee. The second survey included minor verb tense changes and two prompts for written comments. One prompt invited general

comments about the field experience in Milwaukee; the second prompt invited students assigned to a special education classroom (each of whom necessarily was a regular education major) to comment on their experience.

A total of 294 students (70.7%) completed either the first survey, the second survey, or the first and the second survey. Specifically, the response rate for the first survey was 51.9% (n=216), 57.5% for the second survey (n=239), and 38.7% (n=161) for both the first and the second survey. Numerical data were analyzed using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS).

On the second survey, respondents were given opportunities to provide additional written comments. The prompts were:

> What other comments do you have about your O & P field experience in general?
>
> If you were assigned to a special education classroom, what other comments do you have about being assigned to a special education classroom for your O & P field experience?

One hundred eighty-nine participants responded to the first prompt and 27 participants responded to the second prompt. Comments were assigned a rating based on how positive or negative they were, using a five-point Likert scale (5=very positive, 4=positive, 3=neutral, 2=negative, 1=very negative). In addition, the comments were analyzed for emergent categories following standard qualitative research procedures (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). This analysis resulted in assigning 242 comments or portions of comments to one of 25 different

categories. In turn, these 25 categories were organized into three general groups of comments: (1) teaching as a vocation (57 comments, 23.6%), (2) placement considerations (85 comments, 35.1%), and (3) program considerations (100, 41.3%).

Findings

Summaries of the responses to the two Likert scale items reported in this paper are displayed in Table 2 and Table 3. Data are reported for all participants and for five subgroups of participants based on (1) gender, (2) age range, (3) major, (4) level of assigned school, and (5) type of assigned classroom.

Insert Table 2 about here.

Level of school and type of classroom is based on information provided by the respondents on the second survey.

Table 2 and Table 3 provide three kinds of information. The first three columns display the rating of the item from the first survey and the next three columns display the mean rating of the

---

Insert Table 3 about here.

---

item from the second survey. The last three columns display the mean difference between ratings on the second survey and rating on the first survey for participants who completed both the first survey and the second survey. A positive mean indicates increased agreement with the item and a negative mean indicates

decreased agreement the item.

Findings

Grade Level

In general, the participants indicated strong overall agreement that they had been assigned to an appropriate grade level for their preparation as a teacher. There was, however, decreased agreement about this among participants who completed both surveys. By gender, males perceived of their placements as less appropriate than did females. It is also notable that the subgroup of males who completed both surveys showed the second greatest change among all subgroups in the direction of less agreement that their placement was appropriate. By age group, younger participants were more positive about the appropriateness of the grade level of their placement than were older participants. Among participants who completed both surveys, those older than twenty-five indicated considerably less agreement with the appropriateness of their grade level assignment placement at the end of the experience than the other two age range groups.

In general, special education majors viewed their placement level as less appropriate than did their regular education major classmates. However, there is considerable variation by specific major. For example, PreK-Grade 6 majors perceived their grade level placement to be more appropriate when compared to all other regular education majors. Grades 6-12 and K-12 majors believed that their placements were more appropriate in comparison to

PreK-Grade 6 and Grades 1-9 majors, a trend that was especially evident among those who completed both surveys.

Among special education majors, Early Childhood majors indicated the highest agreement regarding the appropriateness of their grade level, more so than any other special education major and Grades 6-12 and K-12 regular education majors. Among the special education majors, ED/BD and MR/CD majors found the grade level of their placement the least appropriate. In fact, among all subgroups, the ED/BD majors who completed both surveys indicated the greatest decrease in the perception that their placement was appropriate in terms of grade level.

For the total group, and for 13 of the 20 subgroups, the perceived appropriateness of grade level was less at the end of the trips than it was at the beginning. Participants placed in middle schools revealed a greater decrease in perceived appropriateness of placement than participants placed in elementary or high schools. The participants placed in high schools more strongly believed that the level of their placement was appropriate than did any other subgroup of participants. Finally, the difference between first survey ratings and second survey ratings reveals that special education majors more strongly supported the appropriateness of their placement grade level at the end of the experience than at the end, whereas regular education majors believed their placements were less appropriate with respect to grade level.

Type of Classroom

With rare exceptions, the participants found the type of their assigned classroom (i.e., regular or special education classroom) to be less appropriate in comparison to the level of their placement (elementary, middle school, high school). Males perceived their assigned classroom to be slightly less appropriate than did females, although males who completed both surveys showed a greater increase in judging their assignment type as appropriate when compared to females. By age subgroup, the perceived appropriateness of classroom type increased for the two younger groups but decreased for the oldest participants, especially evident in the difference between the ratings before and after the trips.

The most striking differences appear in comparing the ratings by major. Special education majors perceived their assigned classroom as considerably less appropriate than did their regular education counterparts. Looking at the data for those participants completing both surveys, three out of four regular education major subgroups (the exception being Grades 6-12) indicated an increased sense of the appropriateness of their assigned classroom, whereas with the exception of Early Childhood, special education major subgroups indicated a reduced sense of the appropriateness of their assigned classroom.

Looking at the three subgroups according to level of assigned school, participants at elementary schools rated their classroom assignment as less appropriate than participants at

middle or high schools. The greatest indication of the perceived appropriateness of assigned classroom emerged among PreK-Grade 6 majors and participants assigned to high schools. Interestingly, among participants who completed both surveys, those assigned to special education classrooms dramatically increased their rating about the appropriateness of their assignment type in comparison to those assigned to regular education classrooms.

Comments

General comments. Among the 239 participants who completed the second survey, 189 (79%) also provided responses to the item requesting general comments. The mean ratings of the comments (5=most positive to 1=most negative) are displayed in Table 4. On average, the comments were positive. As a group, special education majors were less positive in their comments than

---

Insert Table 4 about here.

---

regular education majors. Comparing specific majors, respondents in two special education majors (LD and Early Childhood) were actually more positive in their comments than Grades 6-12 regular education majors.

Many comments suggested that the experience provided important personal career insights. "This was a good experience for me," reported a PreK-Grade 6 major. She continued, "It reinforces the fact that I do want to become a teacher." Another PreK-Grade 6 major wrote, "I think it's a good idea to take O & P

as soon as you can because you'll have a better idea if you want to become a teacher or not."

The comments of some participants also suggested that the experience helped them reach decisions about what specific area of teaching to pursue. "It helped me to decide what grade I want to teach," commented one PreK-Grade 6 major. It is probably for the purpose of career exploration that some participants suggested that students be assigned to multiple classrooms and even to different schools as well. In this regard, a special education major commented:

> I strongly believe that in order for everyone to have a beneficial experience with O & P, we should be able to observe other grades and other schools to give those who aren't sure about their major a better perspective on exactly what they're getting into and to help others decide which age group or which area they'd like to teach.

Many comments suggested that the field experience expanded participants' vision of teaching as an occupation. "A great way to introduce the <u>true</u> profession of teaching to education students," was the comment of a PreK-Grade 6 major. "I had a lot of fun," wrote a Grades 1-9 major, "and really learned a lot about the reality of teaching." One participant assigned to a middle school noted, "I was happy with my placement. It gave me an opportunity to see an educational setting which was very different from anything I had been exposed to."

Not surprisingly, the expanding vision of teaching evident

in many comments was related to having been placed in an urban school. For example, an LD major "coming from such a small town," commented, "The experience opened my eyes to the urban setting," and a Grades 6-12 major noted that "Being in Milwaukee gave me an experience that I wasn't used to growing up in a suburban setting." Besides describing how the experience provided a chance to spend time in an urban school, some participants explicitly noted that it enabled them to correct misconceptions. For instance, a PreK-Grade 6 major reported that "Going to Milwaukee eases my mind, now that I know what it is like" and an Early Childhood major commented, "The kids were great and I think a lot of my stereotypes and preconceptions about Milwaukee Public Schools have vanished."

The participants' comments revealed strong opinions about the level and type of placement, and suggestions for placement policy in the future. Generally, the most positive comments about placements were made by participants who were placed in a grade level or content area that they would have requested, if that had been possible. For example, a Grades K-12 major wrote, "I had a wonderful time being assigned to a classroom in my field. It was to my <u>great</u> advantage" and another Grades K-12 major wrote, "I was very happy I got an art room, because my major is art education." Similarly, a participant with a major in LD and a minor in Bilingual Education commented, "I learned so much by being in a bilingual classroom. I think everyone who has a minor in Spanish or Bilingual Education should have the

opportunity to be in a bilingual classroom."

Not surprisingly, some negative comments focused on perceived mismatches between the participant's major and the assigned placement. For example, one Grades 1-9 major commented:

> I was placed in a Music/Band room in a middle school. My history of using musical instruments or experience with music was almost none. I feel that a special education or regular classroom (other than music) could have been more advantageous to my future as a teacher.

A Grades 6-12 major in business education commented, "As a Business Education major, I would have preferred observing this type of classroom setting [i.e., a business education class] to determine if this is what I really want to do." Regarding assigning regular education majors to special education classrooms, a Grades 6-12 major commented, "If students are placed in a special education classroom for their first semester in a class, you may scare some people from teaching."

In general, special education majors seemed especially displeased not to have been placed in a special education classroom. One ED major commented, "Being a special ed major I was very disappointed I didn't receive any experience in my field. I don't feel it is fair to have my first experience in a class with ED students [postponed until] my student teaching." A CD/MR major commented, "I wish I could have had a chance to experience a Special Education classroom. I have no idea what I'm majoring in, besides the title."

Finally, some students admitted to having changed their minds about the appropriateness of their placement over the course of the experience. This is evident in the comments of two PreK-Grade 6 majors:

> I was very happy with my placement. At first I was angry because I didn't get to choose where I wanted to be but it was the best experience I had.
>
> I'm so glad I was placed in a special education class. I learned a lot. I think I was "afraid" of special education. Now I'm excited to major in special education [a double major]. I think inclusion teachers will have to be flexible and knowledgeable in both areas.

Similarly, a Grades 1-9 major suggested a change of heart about being assigned to a middle school:

> I found my experience at the school very rewarding. When I first learned of my assignment, I wasn't too sure if I would like it or not. But it turned out to be a great experience. Before this I would have never thought of teaching at a middle school. Now I think it would be something I would like to do.

The participants also recommended many other possible placement combinations, including placing students in two or more classrooms, placing students in two or more schools, placing all regular education majors in special education classrooms, placing all majors in both regular and special education classrooms, and placing students in two different types of school districts,

urban and rural. Although not reported in this paper, participants provided comments on many other elements of the experience as well, including scheduling, transportation, relationship of the field experience to the other parts of the Pre-Professional Block, selection of cooperating teachers, and roles and responsibilities of the students, the cooperating teachers, and the university supervisors.

Discussion

Determining placement assignments for students in the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater Pre-Professional Block is a complex process which must address many factors, some of which contradictory and some of which compromise the fullest possible educational value of the experience for individual students. The predispositions of cooperating teachers must be considered. For example, although all cooperating teachers are provided with written guidelines regarding "suggested activities," teachers at the secondary level are often unsure about "what to do" with students who are not majoring in their content area. Furthermore, even if students are majoring in their area, secondary teachers are often uncertain how to work with an early field experience student who is not ready to take over a class as a student teacher might. This discomfort is even more evident among some cooperating teachers in specialty areas, e.g., art, music, physical education, business education, foreign language. The advice of a Grades 6-12 major reflects this concern: "Assign to a related classroom in your major. The U.W.W. student can be

of more help in a subject matter they know about." In contrast, elementary teachers are more comfortable working with students of any major and can quickly find ways to provide them with participatory experiences appropriate to their skills.

There are logistical considerations, sometimes mundane but often unavoidable, that influence how placements are made. For example, taking into account transportation costs for vans, aiming to have students in a school all day, and minimizing the number of sites to be supervised result in efforts to place 11 students in one school where there are only 11 prospective cooperating teachers, regardless of the relative "match" between student preferences and cooperating teachers' assignments, rather than placing the same students in two or three schools, where a pool of 30 prospective cooperating teachers would probably permit a greater "match."

Early field experiences, like the Pre-Professional Block experience, are likely to continue as a common feature of teacher preparation. With evidence of variability in avowed purposes of early field experiences, how they are implemented, and the state licensing requirements they are intended to meet, it is difficult to make general statements about them. It is clear, however, that early field experiences provide teacher educators with opportunities to promote activities among teacher candidates that force them to start at the beginning with a close examination of their orientations and beliefs about teaching (Brookhart & Freeman, 1992).

It may well be that the teacher candidates who are least likely to view as educationally valuable any experiences other than those they themselves believe are worthwhile are most in need of being placed in school settings that are intended to promote disequilibrium (Pajares, 1993). However, such an approach necessitates considerable effort on the part of teacher educators, both in the university and in the school, to ensure that the experiences are indeed educational (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1987).

The complexities of the Pre-Professional field experience suggests that early field experiences must be viewed within the context of a network of vying forces--licensing requirements; predispositions of students and cooperating teachers; transportation needs; time, distance, and resources; competition for placement sites, to mention a few--that can be at odds with pedagogical concerns. The various field experiences required for teacher candidates exist on a continuum. It is reasonable to expect that the last of these experiences, student teaching or internship, is far more greatly influenced by educational considerations than administrative necessities when compared to earlier field experiences.

Criticism about the value of field experiences as generally constructed is widespread (Knowles & Cole, 1996; Zeichner & Gore, 1990), as is criticism about early field experiences in particular (Farris, Henniger, & Bishoff, 1991; Hudson, 1993; Passe, 1994). Still, Lanier and Little's (1986) observation

about field experiences is reasonably hopeful: "The problem is not that field experience cannot be valuable, but that its value is dependent on prospective teachers' being properly prepared to learn from it" (551). In this light, seeking to minimize non-educational interferences and to maximize educational value, even though that may necessitate some displeasure or discomfort in the short run, is an acceptable course of action for those who plan early field experiences for teacher candidates.

References

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1991). RATE [Research about Teacher Education] IV: Teaching Teachers: Facts & Figures. Washington, DC: Author.

Bischoff, J., Farris, P., & Henniger, M. (1988). Student perceptions of early clinical field experiences. Action in Teacher Education, 10(3), 22-25.

Brookhart, S. M., & Freeman, D. J. (1992). Characteristics of entering teacher candidates. Review of Educational Research, 62(1), 37-60.

Clasen, D. R. (1993). Project STREAM: Support, training, and resources for educating able minorities. In C. Callahan, C. Tomlinson, & P. Pizzat (Eds.), Contests for promise: Noteworthy practices and innovations in the identification of gifted students (pp. 2-21). Storrs, CT: The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented.

Clasen, D. R., Middleton, J., & Connell, T. C. (1994). Assessing artistic and problem solving performance in minority and nonminority students using a nontraditional multidimentional approach, Gifted Child Quarterly, 38(1), 27-32.

Epps, M. V. (in press). Pre-professional block incorporating field experience and systematic observation. Teaching Education.

Epps, M. V., & Ganser, T. (1993). Providing an urban field experience for students attending a rural teacher preparation institution. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 355 231).

Farris, P. J., Henniger, M., & Bishoff, J. A. (1991). After

the wave of reform, the role of early clinical experiences in elementary teacher education. Action in Teacher Education, 13(2), 20-24.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. S. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy (pp. 150-170). New York: Longman.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Buchmann, M. (1987). When is student teaching teacher education? Teaching and Teacher Education, 3(4), 255-273.

Ganser, T. (in press). The cooperating teacher role. The Teacher Educator.

Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative research design. New York: Academic Press.

Guyton, E., & McIntyre, D. J. (1990). Student teaching and school experiences. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teacher Education (pp. 514-534). New York: Macmillan.

Howey, K. R., & Zimpher, N. L. (1996). Patterns in prospective teachers: Guides for designing preservice programs. In F. B. Murray (Ed.), The teacher educator's handbook: Building a knowledge base for the preparation of teachers (pp. 465-505). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hudson, L. M. (1993). Enhancing culturally responsive pedagogy: Problems and possibilities. Teacher Education Quarterly, 20(3), 5-17.

Kagan, D. M., & Warren, E. (1991-92). Differential supervision for early, middle, and late field experiences in

teacher education: The case of Emily. Action in Teacher Education, 13(4), 10-16.

Kline, F., & Potthoff, D. (1996). Early field experiences: Exploring supervision models. Unpublished manuscript, Witchita State University.

Knowles, J. G., & Cole, A. L. (1996). Developing practice through field experiences. In F. B. Murray (Ed.), The Teacher Educator's Handbook: Building a Knowledge Base for the Preparation of Teachers (pp. 648-688). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lanier, J. E., & Little, J. W. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching (3rd ed.) (pp. 527-569). New York: Macmillan.

Myers, Jr., E. (1996). Early field experiences: A question of effectiveness. The Teacher Educator, 31(3), 226-237.

National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1995). Standards, Procedures & Policies for the Accreditation of Professional Education Units. Washington, DC: Author.

Pajares, R. (1993). Preservice teachers' beliefs: A focus for teacher education. Action in Teacher Education, 15(2), 45-56.

Passe, J. (1994). Early field experiences in elementary and secondary social studies methods courses. Social Studies, 85(3), 130-133.

Pierce, D. R. (1996). Early field experiences and teacher preparation: Authentic learning. The Teacher Education, 31(3), 217-225.

Potthoff, D., & Kline, F. (1995). Supervision in early field experiences. Teacher Education Quarterly, 22(1), 103-111.

Watts, D. (1987). Student teaching. In M. Haberman & J. M. Backus (Eds.), Advances in teacher education (Vol. 3) (pp. 151-167). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Zeichner, K. M., & Gore, J. M. (1990). Teacher Socialization. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teacher Education, 329-348. New York: Macmillan.

Table 1

Characteristics of survey respondents

Characteristic/feature	n	percent
Male	71	24.15
Female	223	75.85
Up to 20 years old	160	54.42
21-25 years	92	31.29
26 and older	42	14.29
Rural background[1]	125	43.54
Suburban background	136	46.26
Urban background	53	18.03
Public schools[1]	266	90.48
Private schools	76	25.85
Regular Education major	194	65.99
PreK-Grade 6	65	22.11
Grades 1-6	2	0.06
Grades 1-9	47	15.99
Grades 6-12	54	18.37
Grades K-12	26	8.84
Special Education major	92	31.29
EC:EEN	20	6.00
ED/BD	14	4.76
MR/CD	11	3.74
LD	35	11.90
other	12	4.08
Other major (typically double major in regular and special education)	8	2.72

[1]Respondents permitted to select more than one category. Therefore total equals more than 100 percent.

Table 2

Mean of responses to "I have been/was assigned to an appropriate grade level (elementary, middle school, high school) for my preparation as a teacher

Group	Mean of Responses								
	First survey			Second survey			First survey minus second survey		
	n	M	sd	n	M	sd	n	M	sd
All	216	5.96	1.38	239	5.95	1.49	161	-0.14	1.18
Male	53	5.58	1.51	55	5.38	1.82	37	-0.57	1.37
Female	163	6.09	1.31	184	6.11	1.33	124	-0.01	1.09
Up to 20 years old	117	6.06	1.37	137	6.22	1.18	94	0.05	1.07
21-25 years	63	5.86	1.51	67	5.66	1.74	38	-0.29	0.98
26 and older	36	5.83	1.16	35	5.43	1.82	29	-0.55	1.59
Regular Education	146	6.08	1.38	155	6.05	1.48	107	-0.11	1.22
PreK-Grade 6	48	6.46	1.24	51	6.53	1.10	34	0.03	0.90
Grades 1-9	35	5.91	1.29	40	6.25	0.98	28	0.25	1.38
Grades 6-12	47	5.96	1.35	42	5.60	1.74	35	-0.51	1.38
Grades K-12	16	5.81	1.72	18	5.39	1.97	8	-0.38	0.74
Special Education	65	5.77	1.32	78	5.71	1.53	51	-0.20	1.11
Early Childhood	13	6.15	1.28	20	6.30	1.17	13	0.15	0.90
ED/BD	10	6.10	0.88	12	5.42	1.73	8	-0.75	1.39
MR/CD	8	3.50	1.85	10	5.30	1.64	7	0.43	1.13
LD	25	5.88	1.24	30	5.57	1.52	20	-0.40	1.05
Assigned to Elementary	77	6.43	0.83	127	6.24	1.37	77	-0.06	0.95
Assigned to Middle	74	5.74	1.53	100	5.53	1.59	74	-0.20	1.40
Assigned to High	7	6.71	0.76	8	6.75	0.46	7	0.00	1.00
Assigned to Regular Ed	97	6.10	1.25	148	5.92	1.47	97	-0.15	1.09
Assigned to Special Ed	12	5.75	1.76	20	6.25	1.52	12	0.75	1.91

Table 3

Mean of responses to "I have been/was assigned to an appropriate type of classroom (regular or special education) for my preparation as a teacher

Group	Mean of Responses								
	First survey			Second survey			First survey minus second survey		
	n	M	sd	n	M	sd	n	M	sd
All	216	5.43	1.67	239	5.46	1.86	161	0.04	1.67
Male	53	5.34	1.73	55	5.44	1.87	37	0.11	1.35
Female	163	5.46	1.66	184	5.47	1.86	124	0.02	1.76
Up to 20 years old	117	5.42	1.73	137	5.51	1.84	94	0.13	1.46
21-25 years	63	5.37	1.73	67	5.43	1.97	38	0.24	1.90
26 and older	36	5.58	1.40	35	5.34	1.76	29	-0.48	1.92
Regular Education	146	5.82	1.55	155	5.99	1.60	107	0.18	1.44
PreK-Grade 6	48	6.08	1.22	51	6.24	1.10	34	0.15	1.05
Grades 1-9	35	5.46	1.80	40	5.93	1.83	28	0.36	1.81
Grades 6-12	47	5.98	1.41	42	5.88	1.55	35	-0.23	1.54
Grades K-12	16	5.50	1.97	18	5.67	1.97	8	0.75	1.75
Special Education	65	4.58	1.65	78	4.35	1.93	51	-0.25	2.09
Early Childhood	13	4.38	1.80	20	5.00	1.69	13	0.62	1.66
ED/BD	10	4.40	1.71	12	3.92	1.83	8	-1.00	2.83
MR/CD	8	3.50	1.85	10	3.40	1.71	7	-0.29	1.38
LD	25	4.88	1.59	30	4.57	2.01	20	-0.10	1.97
Assigned to Elementary	77	5.44	1.71	127	5.43	1.91	77	-0.06	1.56
Assigned to Middle	74	5.53	1.63	100	5.52	1.77	74	0.16	1.74
Assigned to High	7	6.00	1.91	8	6.25	1.75	7	0.14	2.41
Assigned to Regular Ed	97	5.71	1.25	148	5.57	1.81	97	-0.11	1.65
Assigned to Special Ed	12	4.08	1.88	20	5.10	1.92	12	1.25	1.96

Table 4

General Comments

Group	Mean rating of comments		
	n	M	sd
Combined	189	3.94	1.27
Regular Education Majors	128	4.03	1.19
PreK-Grade 6	45	4.44	0.99
Grades 1-9	32	3.94	1.22
Grades 6-12	41	3.61	1.26
Grades K-12	10	4.20	1.14
Special Education Majors	61	3.75	1.41
Early Childhood	16	3.88	1.50
LD	28	4.07	1.27
ED/BD	9	3.11	1.36
CD/MR	8	3.13	1.55